

Submission 2 to Amended Plans Mar 20 at
26 Seaview Ave Curl Curl NSW
DA 2019/1238

With regard to the amended proposal lodged on Mar 20 at Northern Beaches Council, there does not appear to be any real changes to the plans that either reduce the building bulk from the southern view aspect nor reduce the overlooking and privacy issues to our open spaces, which has increased and therefore our comments from our first submission still apply to the amended plans and design. Our main objections to the amended proposal are as follows.

1. Building Bulk

The south elevation of the amended development on No26 almost identical in bulk and overall dimensions as the first proposal. The wall height is still over 6m in height, projects over 10m beyond our front building line and has the same boundary setback of 940mm (drg. DA09) as the previous plans. The front bedroom setback does little to reduce the bulk as the balcony south side has a full height screen blocking any aspect to the north. While we were unable to access the plan views of the proposal, from the information available on-line, there appears to be a discrepancy as to where the south side is located between drgs DA09 and DA11. I would argue there is less articulation of the south wall in the current proposal but either way this does little to reduce the great bulk of a 6m x 10m wall located 940mm from our northern side boundary.

2. Privacy

Windows w15 and w17 completely overlook our private open space with no regard for our privacy or Council planning guidelines.

3. Shadow Diagrams DA17 and DA18

It is very obvious from these diagrams that over shadowing of our private open space for summer and winter sunlight will be massively affected by this proposal. We consider this to be totally unacceptable.

The shadow diagrams give a clear indication and comparison of the current building footprint of no. 24 with the proposed building footprint of no 26, which is stretched to a maximum on all sides up to the minimum boundary setbacks lines, again with little consideration of local community and Council planning guidelines.

4. View Loss

We currently enjoy 'iconic views' towards Beacon Hill and the Governor Phillip Flag on Beacon Hill, of Brookvale Oval and the North Curl Curl playing fields. The impact of the proposal from the south facing wall, over 6m high and 10.5m long and projecting out from our building line, we assess this view loss resulting as devastating.

Finally, the comments by Watermark Planning (item 4) with regard to the southern neighbour are unhelpful to say the least. The item 2 (Privacy) has been completely overlooked. Wall articulation is less but does nothing to reduce the bulk. The front balcony has full height

screening that I can't see would improve any view aspect. The height poles established on site demonstrate to me the massive bulk of this proposal, when viewed from several directions. I realise the poles represent the proposed heights at building corners; I also realise that the spaces under the top of the poles will be completely filled in with a large building. My understanding from our point of view is that the issue has not been resolved.

The final comment by the planner in item 4 that 'the presentation to the neighbouring site is improved' I find this comment unnecessary as we can establish for ourselves what this proposal will represent to us.

In my first submission, I made several suggestions for revisions to the original plans that would alleviate many of our concerns with this proposal, none of which seem to have been taken seriously. From our perspective, this appears to be a proposal that wants to get the most benefit while the amenity of other neighbouring properties don't seem to be relevant. We would like to see this amended Mar 20 plan substantially altered and reduced in size.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dermot O'Brien". The signature is written in black ink on a white background and is enclosed within a thin black rectangular border.

D. O'Brien

E. Hand-O'Brien